



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/599,272

09/25/2006

Petrus Johannes Lenoir

11543.0013-00000

6405

22852 7590 05/14/2012
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

KING, JOHN B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2435

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/14/2012

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/599,272	LENOIR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John B. King	2435	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on ____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 33-60 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 33-60 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to applicant's amendment filed on December 22, 2011.
2. Claims 33-60 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed December 22, 2011 are considered moot based on the new grounds of rejection as set forth below.

Examiner Notes

4. Examiner cites particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, the applicant fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.
5. The examiner would also like to note that "the Appellant hereby affirms that a transitory propagating signal, is not included within the scope of claim 60". Therefore, claim 60 is statutory as the "computer readable storage medium" does not contain signals per se.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 33-35, 37-49, and 51-60** as best understood are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robert et al. (US Patent 7676846) hereinafter referred to as Robert in view of Nakahara et al. (US Pre-Grant Publication 2003/0018491) hereinafter referred to as Nakahara.

As per claim 33, 47, and 60, Robert discloses A method and system of generating an Authorized Domain (AD), comprising:

selecting a domain identifier uniquely identifying the Authorized Domain (**Robert, col. 6 lines 6-11 and Figure 4, teaches having an entity identifier, which identifies which entities have access to the content. The entities are the authorized domain as they are authorized to view the content.**);

directly binding at least one user to the domain identifier (**Robert, col. 6 lines 6-11 and Figure 4, teaches having an entity identifier that binds the content to an entity. Robert, col. 5 lines 21-23, teaches that an entity can be a person or group of people.**);

and obtaining a number of devices and a number of users that are authorized to access a content item of said Authorized Domain **(Robert, col. 6 lines 6-11, teaches an entity (set of users) that are authorized to access the content. Robert, col. 5 lines 10-14, teaches the user's being able to view their content on any number of devices.)**, wherein the obtaining step comprises:

binding at least one device to at least one user such that the at least one device is directly linked to the at least one user **(Robert, col. 6 lines 28-31, teaches storing the entity certificate on the device that the user wishes to use. This is directly binding the device to the user as the device now stores the user's entity certificate which contains the user's credentials (col. 5 lines 41-51).)**,

and is indirectly linked to the domain identifier through the at least one user **(Robert, col. 7 lines 38-53, teaches the device decrypting the content for the user to view by using the entity certificate of the user. In this case, the device itself is not authorized to view the content. Only the entity/user is authorized to view the content. Therefore, the device is indirectly linked to the domain through the user's certificate.)**

However, Robert does not specifically disclose having a Device Owner List that associates users with devices.

Nakahara discloses obtaining or generating a Device Owner List comprising a unique identifier for a user and a unique identifier for each device belonging to the user, thereby defining that the at least one device is directly bound to the user, or obtaining or generating a Device Owner List for each device to be bound, the Device Owner List

Art Unit: 2435

comprising a unique identifier for a user and a unique identifier for a device belonging to the user, thereby defining that the device is directly bound to the user **(Nakahara, paragraphs 200-201, teaches having a domain list containing the authorized devices. Nakahara, paragraphs 75-78, also teaches having group information comprising user IDs and function unit IDs (of the devices) to determine what access rights the device/user has. Therefore, each user and device has a unique identifier (user ID and function unit ID) and the user created domain list (paragraph 201) binds the devices to that specific user i.e. the devices are directly bound to the user.)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Robert by adding the teachings of Nakahara. Robert teaches that an authorized user can use any device which is a person based approach. Nakahara teaches that the user can only use a list of authorized devices and allowing multiple users to use the same devices, but have different usage restrictions based upon the user of the device which is also a person based domain approach. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the references to result in the system of Robert where the authorized users can only use an authorized device. This approach would allow for different user's to have different access rights and privileges which is generally known and desirable in the art. Adding the features of Nakahara would be applying known techniques to known devices ready for improvement to yield predictable results **(Nakahara, paragraph 197, teaches that**

Art Unit: 2435

both a father and son can use the same device i.e. two users bound to same device, but the son will have different access rights to the content.)

As per claims 34 and 48, Robert in view of Nakahara discloses wherein each device may be bound to only a single user, or each device may be bound to several users, where one user is indicated as a primary user for that particular device **(Nakahara, paragraph 226, teaches having user IDs associated with the authorized devices. Therefore, one or more users may be associated with a particular device. Nakahara, paragraph 201, teaches a user generating his own domain list so that user would be the primary user for those devices.)**

As per claims 35 and 49, Robert in view of Nakahara discloses further comprising importing, on a given device, at least one content item into the Authorized Domain given by the domain identifier by automatically binding, by default, the at least one imported content item to the single user that the given device is bound to or to the user indicated as primary user for the given device, or binding the at least one imported content item to another user using additional information, when non-default binding is to be used **(Robert, col. 6 lines 12-21, teaches importing the content to the device. Nakahara, paragraph 197, teaches importing content into the network that only particular users/devices can have access to.)**

As per claims 37 and 51, Robert in view of Nakahara discloses further comprising using at least one of:

a user identification device as a personal Authorized Domain manager; a personal mobile device as a personal Authorized Domain manager; a mobile phone as a personal Authorized Domain manager; and a PDA (personal digital assistant) as a personal Authorized Domain manager **(Nakahara, paragraph 297-298, teaches the user having an IC card (personal mobile device) containing the PIN to be used with the content usage device. This device will manage whether or not the user has access to content and, therefore, manage the authorized domain of the user.)**

As per claims 38 and 52, Robert in view of Nakahara discloses wherein the binding of at least one user to the domain identifier comprises obtaining or generating a Domain Users List comprising the domain identifier and a unique identifier for a user thereby defining that the user is bound to the Authorized Domain **(Nakahara, paragraphs 77 and 226, teaches having multiple user IDs associated with the authorized domain. Nakahara, paragraph 197, also teaches distinguishing between a father and son on the network and determining what rights the user has based on who the user is. Therefore, there must be a list of user's with their corresponding access rights.)**

As per claims 39 and 53, Robert in view of Nakahara discloses wherein the binding of at least one content item to the Authorized Domain comprises binding a

Art Unit: 2435

content item to a User Right, where said User Right is bound to a user bound to the Authorized Domain **(Nakahara, paragraph 297, teaches the user purchasing a license for the content. A license inherently grants the user the rights that he/she has paid for and that the copyright holder will allow. Paragraph 63 teaches different access rights for content.)**

As per claims 40 and 54, Robert in view of Nakahara discloses wherein the User Right comprises rights data representing which rights exists in relation to the at least one content item bound to the User Right **(Nakahara, paragraph 297, teaches the user purchasing a license for the content. A license inherently grants the user the rights that he/she has paid for and that the copyright holder will allow. Paragraph 63 teaches different access rights for content.)**

As per claims 41 and 55, Robert in view of Nakahara discloses further comprising controlling access, by a given device being operated by a given user, to a given content item comprising checking whether a user, the given content item is linked to, and a user, the given device is linked to, belongs to the same Authorized Domain, and allowing access for the given user and/or other users via the given device to the content item if so, and/or checking if the given content item is linked to a user belonging to the same Authorized Domain as the given user, and allowing access for the given user via the given device and/or other devices to the content item if so **(Robert, col. 7 lines 38-53, teaches only granting access if the user's entity certificate can be**

Art Unit: 2435

validated i.e. the user is in the authorized domain. Nakahara, paragraphs 194-197, also teaches only granting access to the content if the device is authorized and the user is granted access to the content through the usage restriction i.e. both the user and the device must be authorized for access and part of the same authorized domain.)

As per claims 42 and 56, Robert in view of Nakahara discloses further comprising controlling access, by a given device being operated by a given user, to a given content item being bound to the Authorized Domain and having a unique content identifier, wherein controlling access comprises:

checking if the user bound to the given device is bound to the same Authorized Domain as the user bound to the content item, by checking if the Domain User List of the Authorized Domain comprises: a first user identifier, wherein a Device Owner List comprises an identifier of the given device and the first user identifier, and a second user identifier, linked to the given content item **(Robert, col. 7 lines 38-53, teaches only granting access if the user's entity certificate can be validated. Nakahara, paragraphs 194-197, also teaches granting or restricting access to content based on whether user and device authorization requirements are met.);**

and allowing access to the given content item by the given device operated by any user and/or checking if the Domain User List of the Authorized Domain, that the content item is bound to, comprises a user identifier of the given user thereby checking if the given user is bound to the same Authorized Domain as the content item, and

Art Unit: 2435

allowing access to the given content item by any device including the given device operated by the given user **(Nakahara, paragraphs 194-197, teaches granting or restricting access to content based on whether user and device authorization requirements are met.)**

As per claims 43 and 57, Robert in view of Nakahara discloses wherein the controlling of access of a given content item comprises checking that the User Right for the given content item specifies that the given user has the right to access the given content item and only allowing access to the given content item in the affirmative **(Nakahara, paragraph 63, teaches the license information containing information about the usage rights that the user has for the content. Nakahara, paragraphs 194-197, also teaches only granting access if the user has the appropriate access rights.)**

As per claims 44 and 58, Robert in view of Nakahara discloses wherein every content item is encrypted and that a content right is bound to each content item and to a User Right, and that the content right of a given content item comprises a decryption key for decrypting the given content item **(Robert, col. 7 lines 38-53, teaches decrypting the content using a decryption key from the user's entity certificate. Nakahara, paragraphs 48-50, also teaches content encryption and decryption keys to decrypt the content items.)**

Art Unit: 2435

As per claims 45 and 59, Robert in view of Nakahara discloses wherein the Domain Users List is implemented as or included in a Domain Users Certificate, and/or the Device Owner List is implemented as or included in a Device Owner Certificate, and/or the User Right is implemented as or included in a User Right Certificate **(Nakahara, paragraphs 198, 249-251, and 258, teaches license authentication being included in certificates. Robert, col. 5 lines 41-51, also teaches having an entity certificate which defines which people/groups of people have access to the content.)**

As per claim 46, Robert in view of Nakahara discloses further comprising binding at least one content item to at least one user **(Robert, col. 6 lines 6-11, teaches binding content to an entity. Robert, col. 5 lines 21-23, teaches that an entity is a user or group of users. Therefore, the content is bound to a user or group of users.)**

8. **Claims 36 and 50** as best understood are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robert in view of Nakahara and further in view of Hernandez et al. (US Pre-Grant Publication 2003/0093298) hereinafter referred to as Hernandez.

As per claims 36 and 50, Robert in view of Nakahara does not specifically teach limiting the number of users.

Art Unit: 2435

Hernandez discloses providing a domain size limitation, where the limitation relates to a maximum number of users (**Hernandez, paragraph 41, teaches having a maximum number of users in a domain.**)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of Robert and Nakahara with the teachings of Hernandez. Robert, col. 1 lines 49-52, teaches limiting the number of devices that are allowed in an authorized domain and Hernandez teaches limiting the number of users in a domain. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the references to result in the system of Robert where the size limitation is based on the maximum number of users. This would be using a known technique to improve similar devices in the same way.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John B. King whose telephone number is (571)270-7310. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Fri. 7:30 AM - 4:00 PM est..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2435

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John B King/

Examiner, Art Unit 2435

/Kimyen Vu/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2435